

# New method for the extrapolation of finite-size data to infinite volume

Sergio Caracciolo<sup>a</sup>, Robert G. Edwards<sup>b</sup>, Sabino J. Ferreira<sup>c</sup>, Andrea Pelissetto<sup>d</sup> and Alan D. Sokal<sup>e\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università degli Studi di Lecce, Lecce 73100, ITALIA

<sup>b</sup>SCRI, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA

<sup>c</sup>Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG 30161, BRASIL

<sup>d</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Pisa, Università degli Studi di Pisa, Pisa 56100, ITALIA

<sup>e</sup>Department of Physics, New York University, 4 Washington Place, New York, NY 10003, USA

We present a simple and powerful method for extrapolating finite-volume Monte Carlo data to infinite volume, based on finite-size-scaling theory. We discuss carefully its systematic and statistical errors, and we illustrate it using three examples: the two-dimensional three-state Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice, and the two-dimensional  $O(3)$  and  $O(\infty)$   $\sigma$ -models. In favorable cases it is possible to obtain reliable extrapolations (errors of a few percent) even when the correlation length is 1000 times larger than the lattice.

Quantum field theorists are interested primarily in infinite systems; but Monte Carlo simulations must perforce be carried out on lattices of finite linear size  $L$ , limited by computer memory and speed. This raises the problem of extrapolating finite-volume data to  $L = \infty$ . We present here a simple and powerful method for performing this extrapolation, based on finite-size-scaling theory [1]; and we discuss carefully its systematic and statistical errors. We illustrate the method using three examples: the two-dimensional three-state Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice [2], and the two-dimensional  $O(3)$  and  $O(\infty)$   $\sigma$ -models [3,4]. We have found — much to our surprise — that in favorable cases it is possible to obtain reliable extrapolations (errors of a few percent) at  $\xi/L$  as large as 10–1000. More details can be found in [5].

Consider, for starters, a model controlled by a renormalization-group (RG) fixed point having *one* relevant operator. Let us work on a periodic lattice of linear size  $L$ . Let  $\xi(\beta, L)$  be a suitably defined finite-volume correlation length (we use the second-moment correlation length defined by equations (4.11)–(4.13) of [6]), and let  $\mathcal{O}$  be any long-distance observable (e.g. the corre-

lation length or the susceptibility). Then finite-size-scaling theory [1] predicts that

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)}{\mathcal{O}(\beta, \infty)} = f_{\mathcal{O}}(\xi(\beta, \infty)/L) + O(\xi^{-\omega}, L^{-\omega}) \quad (1)$$

where  $f_{\mathcal{O}}$  is a universal function and  $\omega$  is a correction-to-scaling exponent. Hence, if  $s$  is any fixed scale factor (usually we take  $s = 2$ ),

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(\beta, sL)}{\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)} = F_{\mathcal{O}}(\xi(\beta, L)/L) + O(\xi^{-\omega}, L^{-\omega}) \quad (2)$$

where  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$  can be expressed in terms of  $f_{\mathcal{O}}$ ,  $f_{\xi}$ .

Our method proceeds as follows [7]: Make Monte Carlo runs at numerous pairs  $(\beta, L)$  and  $(\beta, sL)$ . Plot  $\mathcal{O}(\beta, sL)/\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)$  versus  $\xi(\beta, L)/L$ , using those points satisfying both  $\xi(\beta, L) \geq$  some value  $\xi_{min}$  and  $L \geq$  some value  $L_{min}$ . If all these points fall with good accuracy on a single curve — thus verifying the Ansatz (2) for  $\xi \geq \xi_{min}$ ,  $L \geq L_{min}$  — choose a smooth fitting function  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ . Then, using the functions  $F_{\xi}$  and  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$ , extrapolate the pair  $(\xi, \mathcal{O})$  successively from  $L \rightarrow sL \rightarrow s^2L \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \infty$ .

We have chosen to use functions  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$  of the form

$$F_{\mathcal{O}}(x) = 1 + a_1 e^{-1/x} + \dots + a_n e^{-n/x} \quad (3)$$

This form is partially motivated by theory, which tells us that  $F(x) \rightarrow 1$  exponentially fast as  $x \rightarrow$

---

\*Speaker at the conference.

0 [10]. Typically a fit of order  $3 \leq n \leq 12$  is sufficient; we increase  $n$  until the  $\chi^2$  of the fit becomes essentially constant. The resulting  $\chi^2$  value provides a check on the systematic errors arising from corrections to scaling and/or from the inadequacies of the form (3).

The *statistical* error on the extrapolated value of  $\mathcal{O}_\infty(\beta) \equiv \mathcal{O}(\beta, \infty)$  comes from three sources: (i) error on  $\mathcal{O}(\beta, L)$ , which gets multiplicatively propagated to  $\mathcal{O}_\infty$ ; (ii) error on  $\xi(\beta, L)$ , which affects the argument  $x \equiv \xi(\beta, L)/L$  of the scaling functions  $F_\xi$  and  $F_\mathcal{O}$ ; and (iii) statistical error in our estimate of the coefficients  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  in  $F_\xi$  and  $F_\mathcal{O}$ . The errors of type (i) and (ii) depend on the statistics available at the single point  $(\beta, L)$ , while the error of type (iii) depends on the statistics in the whole set of runs. Errors (i)+(ii) [resp. (i)+(ii)+(iii)] can be quantified by performing a Monte Carlo experiment in which the input data at  $(\beta, L)$  [resp. the whole set of input data] are varied randomly within their error bars and then extrapolated.

The discrepancies between the extrapolated values from different lattice sizes at the same  $\beta$  — to the extent that these exceed the estimated statistical errors — indicate the presence of systematic errors and thus the necessity of increasing  $L_{min}$  and/or  $\xi_{min}$  and/or  $n$ .

A figure of (de)merit of the method is the relative variance on the extrapolated value  $\mathcal{O}_\infty(\beta)$ , multiplied by the computer time needed to obtain it. We expect this *relative variance-time product* [for errors (i)+(ii) only] to scale as

$$\text{RVTP}(\beta, L) \approx \xi_\infty(\beta)^{d+z_{int,\mathcal{O}}} G_\mathcal{O}(\xi_\infty(\beta)/L) \quad (4)$$

where  $d$  is the spatial dimension and  $z_{int,\mathcal{O}}$  is the dynamic critical exponent of the Monte Carlo algorithm being used; here  $G_\mathcal{O}$  is a combination of several static and dynamic finite-size-scaling functions, and depends both on the observable  $\mathcal{O}$  and on the algorithm but not on the scale factor  $s$ . As  $\xi_\infty/L$  tends to zero, we expect  $G_\mathcal{O}$  to diverge as  $(\xi_\infty/L)^{-d}$  (it is wasteful to use a lattice  $L \gg \xi_\infty$ ). As  $\xi_\infty/L$  tends to infinity, we expect  $G_\mathcal{O} \sim (\xi_\infty/L)^p$  [5], but the power  $p$  can be either positive or negative. If  $p > 0$ , there is an optimum value of  $\xi_\infty/L$ ; this determines the best

lattice size at which to perform runs for a given  $\beta$ . If  $p < 0$ , it is most efficient to use the *smallest* lattice size for which the corrections to scaling are negligible compared to the statistical errors.

Our first example [2] is the two-dimensional three-state Potts antiferromagnet on the square lattice, which is believed to have a critical point at  $\beta = \infty$  [11]. We used the Wang-Swendsen-Kotecký cluster algorithm [12], which appears to have *no* critical slowing-down ( $\tau_{int, \mathcal{M}_{stag}^2} < 5$  uniformly in  $\beta$  and  $L$ ) [2]. We ran on lattices  $L = 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 1536$  at 153 different pairs  $(\beta, L)$  in the range  $5 \lesssim \xi_\infty \lesssim 20000$ . Each run was between  $2 \times 10^5$  and  $2.2 \times 10^7$  iterations, and the total CPU time was modest by our standards (about 2 years on an IBM RS-6000/370). We took  $\xi_{min} = 10$  and  $L_{min} = 128$  and used a quintic fit in (3); the result for  $F_\xi$  is shown in [2,5] ( $\chi^2 = 75.41$ , 66 DF, level = 20%). The extrapolated values from different lattice sizes at the same  $\beta$  agree within the estimated statistical errors ( $\chi^2 = 43.03$ , 75 DF, level > 99%). The result for  $G_\xi$  is shown in [5]: the errors are roughly constant for  $\xi_\infty/L \gtrsim 0.4$  but rise sharply for smaller  $\xi_\infty/L$ . In practice we were able to obtain  $\xi_\infty$  to an accuracy of about 1% (resp. 2%, 3%, 5%) at  $\xi_\infty \approx 1000$  (resp. 2000, 5000, 10000).

Next let us consider [3,4] the two-dimensional  $O(3)$   $\sigma$ -model (see Caracciolo's talk for more details). We used the Wolff embedding algorithm with standard Swendsen-Wang updates; again critical slowing-down appears to be completely eliminated. We ran on lattices  $L = 32, 48, 64, 96, 128, 192, 256, 384, 512$  at 180 different pairs  $(\beta, L)$  in the range  $20 \lesssim \xi_\infty \lesssim 10^5$ . Each run was between  $10^5$  and  $5 \times 10^6$  iterations, and the total CPU time was 7 years on an IBM RS-6000/370. We took  $\xi_{min} = 20$  and used a tenth-order fit. There appear to be weak corrections to scaling (of order  $\lesssim 1.5\%$ ) in the region  $0.3 \lesssim \xi_L/L \lesssim 0.7$  for lattices with  $L \lesssim 64-96$ . We therefore chose  $L_{min} = 128$  for  $\xi_L/L \leq 0.7$ , and  $L_{min} = 64$  for  $\xi_L/L > 0.7$ . The result for  $F_\xi$  is shown in [4,5] ( $\chi^2 = 72.91$ , 73 DF, level = 48%). The result for  $G_\xi$  is shown in [5]; at large  $\xi_\infty/L$  it *decreases* sharply, with a power  $p \approx -2$  in agree-

ment with theory [5]. In practice we obtained  $\xi_\infty$  to an accuracy of about 0.2% (resp. 0.7%, 1.1%, 1.6%) at  $\xi_\infty \approx 10^2$  (resp.  $10^3$ ,  $10^4$ ,  $10^5$ ).

We also carried out a “simulated Monte Carlo” experiment for the  $O(N)$   $\sigma$ -model at  $N = \infty$ , by generating data from the exact finite-volume solution plus random noise of 0.1% for  $L = 64, 96, 128$ , 0.2% for  $L = 192, 256$  and 0.5% for  $L = 384, 512$  [which is the order of magnitude we attain in practice for  $O(3)$ ]. We considered 35 values of  $\beta$  in the range  $20 \lesssim \xi_\infty \lesssim 10^6$ . We used  $\xi_{min} = 20$  and  $L_{min} = 64$  (in fact much smaller values could have been used, as corrections to scaling are here very small) and a ninth-order fit; for two different data sets we get  $\chi^2 = 114$  (resp. 118) with 166 DF. In practice we obtain  $\xi_\infty$  with an accuracy of 0.6% (resp. 1.2%, 2%, 3%) at  $\xi_\infty \approx 10^3$  (resp.  $10^4$ ,  $10^5$ ,  $10^6$ ). Here we can also compare the extrapolated values  $\xi_\infty^{extr}(\beta)$  with the exact values  $\xi_\infty^{exact}(\beta)$ . Defining  $\mathcal{R} = \sum_\beta [\xi_\infty^{extr}(\beta) - \xi_\infty^{exact}(\beta)]^2 / \sigma^2(\beta)$ , we find for the two data sets  $\mathcal{R} = 17.19$  (resp. 25.81) with 35 DF. Only 6 (resp. 9) points differ from the exact value more than one standard deviation, and none by more than two.

Details on all of these models will be reported separately [2,4].

The method is easily generalized to a model controlled by an RG fixed point having  $k$  relevant operators. It suffices to choose  $k - 1$  dimensionless ratios of long-distance observables, call them  $R = (R_1, \dots, R_{k-1})$ ; then the function  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$  will depend parametrically on  $R(\beta, L)$ . In practice one can divide  $R$ -space into “slices” within which  $F_{\mathcal{O}}$  is empirically constant within error bars, and perform the fit (3) within each slice. We have used this approach to study the mixed isovector/isotensor  $\sigma$ -model, taking  $R$  to be the ratio of isovector to isotensor correlation length [3,4].

The method can also be applied to extrapolate the exponential correlation length (inverse mass gap). For this purpose one must work in a system of size  $L^{d-1} \times T$  with  $T \gg \xi_{exp}(\beta, L)$  (cf. [8]).

We wish to thank Martin Hasenbusch and especially Jae-Kwon Kim for sharing their data with us, and for challenging us to push to ever larger values of  $\xi/L$ . This research was supported by CNR, INFN, CNPq, FAPEMIG,

DOE contracts DE-FG05-85ER250000 and DE-FG05-92ER40742, NSF grant DMS-9200719, and NATO CRG 910251.

## REFERENCES

1. V. Privman, ed., *Finite Size Scaling and Numerical Simulation of Statistical Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).
2. S.J. Ferreira and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/9405015; and in preparation.
3. S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3906 (1993).
4. S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/9411009; and in preparation.
5. S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, S.J. Ferreira, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, hep-lat/9409004.
6. S. Caracciolo, R.G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A.D. Sokal, Nucl. Phys. **B403**, 475 (1993).
7. Our method has many features in common with those of Lüscher, Weisz and Wolff [8] and Kim [9]. In particular, all these methods share the property of working only with observable quantities ( $\xi$ ,  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $L$ ) and not with bare quantities ( $\beta$ ). Therefore, they rely only on “scaling” and not on “asymptotic scaling”; and they differ from other FSS-based methods such as phenomenological renormalization.
8. M. Lüscher, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. **B359**, 221 (1991).
9. J.-K. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1735 (1993); Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **34**, 702 (1994); University of Arizona preprints AZPH-TH/93-49 and AZPH-TH/94-15.
10. H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. **B233**, 183 (1989); S. Caracciolo and A. Pelissetto, in preparation.
11. R.J. Baxter, Proc. Roy. Soc. London **A383**, 43 (1982).
12. J.-S. Wang, R.H. Swendsen and R. Kotecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 109 (1989) and Phys. Rev. **B42**, 2465 (1990); M. Lubin and A.D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1778 (1993).